DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 348 FL 026 271

AUTHOR Cho, Yunkyoung
TITLE Use of Connectives in Writings by Korean Learners of English.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conjunctions; Dialogs (Language); *Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); Error Patterns; Foreign Countries; Junior High School Students; Junior High Schools; Korean; Language Patterns; Oral Language; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Syntax; Transfer of Training; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS South Korea

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the use of connectives by learners of English as a foreign language and their length of study. Eighteen writing samples were collected, six from learners with 2 years of study of English and 12 from learners with 3 years of study. Results found that students' length of study was related to the overall occurrence of the range of connectives produced, but it did not lead to a greater number of subordinators, which contribute to the syntactic complexity of a sentence. Furthermore, different connectives were shown to be associated more with certain types of errors than with others. The pedagogical implications of this study are twofold. First, the tendency to over-generalize the rules about using connectives and the excessive use of linking devices may hinder the natural flow of messages and lead to artificial and mechanical writing. Second, students should be taught about the grammatical constraints of individual connectives, because half of the incorrect uses of connectives resulted from not observing those constraints. Learners also need to become aware of the difference in register between spoken and written discourse; many of the errors in this study were caused by the transfer of the conventions of speech to writing. Students should therefore be exposed to more formal texts to help them understand the different conventions. (Contains 37 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 348

FL

Use of Connectives in Writings by Korean Learners of English

Yunkyoung Cho

(Teachers College, Columbia University)

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the use of connectives and length of study, and to describe and explain learners' use of connectives. Eighteen writing samples were collected, six from learners with 2 years of study of English and twelve from learners with 3 years of study. This study found that length of study was related to the overall occurrence and the range of connectives produced; but it did not lead to a greater number of subordinators, which contribute to syntactic complexity of a sentence. Furthermore, different connectives were shown to be associated more with certain types of errors than with others. Finally, the pedagogical implications of this study are discussed.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Yunkyoung Cho

INTRODUCTION

Connectives[1] are crucial in writing in that they help readers recognize the relationships between ideas and follow the thread of messages that the writer wants to convey (Zamel, 1983). By connecting individual clauses, sentences, and paragraphs into a single theme, connectives make obvious and visible the writer's "line of thought" (Broadhead & Berlin, 1981, p. 306).

The logical relations between two ideas exist in and of themselves; thus, all that a writer has to do is to choose a connective that appropriately expresses these relations (Goldman & Murray, 1992). When a writer fails to make proper use of connectives, the whole message of a text is vague although individual sentences can be clear (McClure & Steffensen, 1985). Such failure is something that Korean learners of English are likely to experience. According to Hinds (1987), writers and readers have different roles in different cultures. In many East Asian countries,

[1] The term 'connectives' in this paper refers to conjunctions linking two structures such as clauses or sentences. This research does not take into account conjunctions connecting words or phrases.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL026271

effective communication between writers and readers is the readers' responsibility, as opposed to Western conventions where it is the writers' responsibility. Since writers in Asian countries are allowed to leave readers guessing the relations between propositions, Korean writers may not use connectives when writing in English; this can lessen the clarity of their message. Therefore, successful writing in English by Korean learners requires overcoming such cultural differences, in addition to linguistic problems.

Many studies on the acquisition of connectives in writing in English as the first language or as a second language (Beebe, 1980; Goldman & Murray, 1992; Kanno, 1989; Norment, 1994, 1995; Yde & Spoelders, 1985; Zarnowski, 1983) base their discussion on the taxonomies of connectives suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976). They classify logical connectives into four major types (additive, causal, adversative, and temporal), based on the meaning relation that they signal (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1983).

However, within a semantic category, a grammatical categorization such as coordinator and subordinator is also possible; for example, *so* is a coordinator and *because* a subordinator within the causal category in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) framework. From this perspective, research on first language acquisition has reported that children use more coordinators as opposed to subordinators, and that the number of both types of connectives increases with age (Dromi & Berman, 1986; Gutierrez-Clellen & Hofstetter, 1994; Klecan-Aker & Lopez, 1985; Scott, 1988).

While age and/or cognitive ability are related to the acquisition of connectives in the first language, in second language acquisition proficiency also affects the use of connectives. For instance, Norment (1994, 1995) found that Chinese and Spanish ESL writers with a high proficiency employed twice as many connectives as those with a low proficiency. The present study examines the use of connectives in writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) by Korean learners. Particularly, this study is interested in investigating how length of English study is related to the use of

connectives in writings. The grammatical categorization of connectives such as coordinator and subordinator[2] rather than their semantic classification will be used in the analysis. The present study proposes the following hypotheses.

1. Length of study is related to the use of a greater number of subordinators, thus, the production of syntactically complex sentences.
2. Length of study affects the range of coordinators and subordinators used.
3. Length of study increases correct uses of connectives, and decreases incorrect uses.

Furthermore, since this study involves an analysis of the interlanguage of learners, an attempt is made to describe and explain learners' use of connectives, thus, contributing to a deeper understanding of learner interlanguage.

METHOD

Subjects

For the present study, eighteen writing samples were collected, six from learners with 2 years of study and twelve from learners with 3 years of study. The age of the participants ranged from 10 to 12, with a mean age of 10.9 years. All of the participants attended a private English institute in Seoul, Korea. At that institute, they were taught by different instructors, who informed the researcher that they did

---

[2] Most linguists and grammarians agree that *and, or,* and *but* are coordinators, whereas disagreement exists about whether *so* and *yet* also belong to the coordinators. In the present study, following Azar (1989), Frank (1972), and Frodesen and Eyring (1993), it is assumed that *and, but, or, so,* and *yet* are coordinators, while subordinators include adverbials (*because, when, if, though,* etc.), relative pronominals (*who, which, that, what,* etc.), and conjuncts (*however, nonetheless,* etc.).

not explicitly instruct the meanings and usage of connectives. Since they could afford to attend a private institute besides a regular school, it is presumed that the participants were from middle-class or upper middle-class families. (Refer to Appendix A for detailed information about the participants.)

Data Collection Procedures

Since the type of a text has a significant effect on the use of different kinds of connectives (Yde & Spoelders, 1985), a single prompt for the writing task was given to the participants. They were asked to write about what their dreams for the future were. This writing task was given to the participants as a homework assignment. (See Appendix B for several writing samples.)

Data Analysis Procedures

Prior to the data analysis, the writing samples were typed in order to prevent the handwriting from interfering with judgements on connectives. Besides, spelling and grammatical mistakes were corrected by the researcher to keep the focus on connectives only.

Data analysis was divided into two parts. First, to examine the effect of length of study on the overall occurrence of connectives, the researcher calculated the average number of connectives produced by the two groups: learners (6 participants) having studied English for 2 years and learners (12 participants) having studied English for 3 years. The second part of the analysis was concerned with evaluating the use of connectives. Judgments on the connectives produced in the texts were made by two English instructors who have been working as editors at the Writing Skills Center at Teachers College, Columbia University. Evaluation on the use of connectives might be subjective. However, inter-rater reliability was quite high, being a value of .98* (significant at the level of 0.05), measured by Pearson

Product-Moment Correlations. The evaluation of the connectives in the texts was based on the rubric shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Rubric

Categories	Guidelines
Correct use	The connective used corresponds appropriately to the relation that exists between sentences.
Incorrect use	
Misuse	The connective used is not consistent with the relation that exists between sentences.
Overuse	The connective is used where the connection between sentences is so obvious that it does not require any connective.
Underuse	A connective is not use where a connective is needed.
Grammar error (stylistic error)	A connective represents a correct semantic property, but it does not observe a grammatical restriction on the use of the connective.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Relationship between length of study and overall occurrence of connectives

Table 2 displays the average number of words, of connectives, and of T-units, and the average scores for conjunctive cohesion of texts produced by each group. The total number of words in a text indicates composition length, which can be related to the total number of connectives. Following Hunt (1965; cited in Barnwell, 1988), a T-unit is one independent clause, with all subordinate phrases or clauses attached to it. Conjunctive cohesion scores were computed by dividing the

number of conjunctive ties by the number of T-units in a text (conjunctive/T-units) (Cameron, Lee, Webster, Kim, Hunt, Linton, 1995). A cohesion score is an indicator of the subordination of a sentence produced, that is, syntactic complexity.[3]

The results show that the group with 3 years of study produced more words, more connectives, and more T-units than that with 2 years of study. This suggests that the students who studied longer were more likely to produce a longer text, which tends to require more connectives. However, the conjunctive cohesion scores showed only a very slight difference between the two groups, which may indicate that length of study does not have a great impact on producing syntactically complex sentences with subordinate clauses.[4]

TABLE 2

Average of the Writing Measures

Length of study (years)	Number of words	Number of connectives	Number of T-units	Conjunctive cohesion score
3	116.3	8.5	15.8	0.6
2	70.8	4.0	9.5	0.5

[3] A T-unit does not seem to tell us anything about the syntactic complexity of a sentence, whereas a conjunctive cohesion score calculated in the aforementioned way can show the subordination of a sentence, indicating the complexity of the sentence. For example, two clauses combined by a subordinator, such as *I want to be a dancer because it will be fun*, has one T-unit and one connective; thus, its cohesion score is one. On the other hand, two clauses combined by a coordinator, such as *My mother wants me to be a doctor, but my father wants me to be a teacher*, has two T-units and one connective; thus, its cohesion score is 0.5. Therefore, the higher the scores for the conjunctive cohesion, the more syntactically complex a text is. On the other hand, Schleppegrell (1992) warns that taking the number of subordinate clauses as a signal of linguistic complexity may result in a misleading analysis. She argues that linguistic complexity as an indicator of language proficiency or skill should be measured at the discourse level beyond the sentence level.

Classifying connectives into coordinators and subordinators, Table 3 summarizes their average number produced by each group. The group with 3 years of study employed twice as many coordinators and slightly more subordinators than that with 2 years of study. Within the former group, twice as many coordinators as subordinators were produced. However, contradictory to studies on first language acquisition, the group with 2 years of study produced more subordinators than coordinators.

TABLE 3

Average Number of Coordinators and Subordinators Produced

Length of study (years)	Coordinators	Subordinators
3	5.7	2.8
2	1.7	2.3

This unexpected finding might be explained if we take a closer look at the number of the individual connectives produced by each group and by each participant. Table 4 shows the average number of each connective employed by each group. The group with 2 years of study produced more than twice as many *if*s as the other group. Yet, this result does not necessarily mean that length of study is negatively related to the use of the subordinator *if*. It turned out that all the examples of *if*-clauses in the group with 2 years of study were produced by only one participant. These *if*s were all the connectives that this participant produced in addition to one *because*. If we disregard the number of *if*s produced by him/her, the average number of the subordinators used by the 2-year group would be 1.5, which is less than the average number of the coordinators employed by this group. Such an excessive use of *if* by one person seems to have contributed to the unexpected finding that the

[4] This unexpected result led the researcher to reanalyze the data in terms of age. It was found, however, that the cohesion scores did not increase with age, being 0.6, 0.7, and 0.6 in the

group with 2 years of study produced more subordinators than coordinators. Therefore, this surprising result seems due to the small sample size in the present study.

TABLE 4

Average Number of Overall Occurrence of Each Connectives

Length of study (years)	Coordinators			Subordinators					
	and	but	So	Because	if	when	anyway	who	what
3	2.3	2.3	1.2	2.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
2	0.7	0.8	0.2	1.5	0.8	0	0	0	0

Besides, two findings shown in Table 4 deserve attention. First, as could be expected, considering the length of study of English (average 2.67 years), all the participants chose a single connective from each semantic category; for example, *and* as an additive connection, *but* as an adversative connection, *so* for cause-and-effect coordination, *because* for cause-and-effect subordination, *if* as a conditional connective, etc.

Another noteworthy finding is that in the category of causative connectives, *because* was chosen much more often than *so* by both groups. Yet, more significantly, the frequency of occurrence of *so* and *because* within each group was different. The connective *so* turned out to account for 34% of the causative connectives produced by the group with 3 years of study, while it accounted for only 12% in the group with 2 years of study. This result might suggest that *so* is acquired later than *because* in that the choice within the causative category was shown to move from *because* to *so* with length of study.[5] Research has reported that between

---

groups of 12-, 11-, and 10-year olds, respectively.

[5] McClure and Steffensen (1985) report that in first language acquisition *because* is mastered even before *and*.

a real-world cause-effect order *(Because* X, Y; X, *so* Y) and a reverse order (Y *because* X), children more frequently produce the latter in spoken English, while they often make errors in comprehending it (Bebout, Segalowitz, and White, 1980). In a similar way, the participants in this study may have found it easier to produce a reverse order (Y because X) in a written mode. Alternatively, a *because*-clause may have been used as an "afterthought" (Schleppegrell, 1996, p. 277), which may function as a supportive sentence. This should be the object of future study.

At this point, it should be emphasized that not every participant produced all the connectives listed in Table 4. The range of connectives produced by each participant was found to be quite limited. Table 5 shows the range of coordinators and subordinators, expressed by the average number of different connectives produced by the participants in each group.

Not surprisingly, the group with 3 years of study was found to employ a wider range of connectives, in both coordination and subordination, than that with 2 years of study. It is interesting, though, that the two groups showed a difference in proportions of coordinators and subordinators produced. The group with 3 years of study shows a more varied use of coordinators than of subordinators. On the other hand, the group with 2 years of study employed as many different subordinators as coordinators. This can be attributed to the more frequent choice of the subordinator *because* over the coordinator *so* by that group.

TABLE 5

Range of Coordinators and Subordinators

Length of study (years)	Coordinators	Subordinators	Total
3	2.3	1.3	3.6
2	1.2	1.2	2.3

So far, the discussion has addressed the overall occurrence of connectives. Yet, it should be noted that the number of connectives produced includes all kinds of uses of connectives such as correct uses and incorrect uses. The different uses of connectives will be discussed in the next section.

Relationship between length of study and correct/incorrect use of connectives

Table 6 displays the average number of correct and incorrect uses of coordinators and subordinators by each group. Overall, length of study seems to have an effect on the correct use of connectives. On the other hand, it is rather surprising to find that incorrect uses increased with length of study. Yet, this could have been expected, considering that the participants with 3 years of study produced more connectives (Table 2) and that they have not yet completed the acquisition of connectives. They had more opportunities to make errors than the participants with 2 years of study, by producing more connectives.

TABLE 6

Average Number of Correct and Incorrect Use

Length of study (years)	Correct			Incorrect		
	Coordinators	Subordinators	Total	Coordinators	Subordinators	Total
3	3.7	1.6	5.3	2.1	1.4	3.5
2	1.2	1.5	2.7	0.9	0.8	1.7

Incorrect uses include four types of errors such as misuse, overuse, underuse, and grammar errors (see Table 1). The percentage of the four incorrect uses of connectives by each group is summarized in Table 7. Noticeably, no error of underuse was made by the group with 3 years of study. This may suggest that length of study

enhances students' awareness of when the sentences should be connected with the help of connectives.

At the same time, though, length of study also appears to be related to overuse: the longer the students studied, the more likely they were to use connectives where they were unnecessary. However, research has reported many instances of overuse of connectives in texts written by children or second language learners, who have yet to acquire a (target) language (Field & Yip, 1992; Goldman & Murray, 1992; Granger & Tyson, 1996; Milton & Tsang, 1993). Thus, this result of the present study provides additional evidence that such overuse is one of the developmental patterns in the acquisition of connectives. Besides, it is quite understandable—considering participants' short period of English instruction and particularly the fact that no instruction on connective usage was provided—that grammar errors were responsible for a half of the incorrect uses by both groups.

TABLE 7

Percentage of Four Types of Incorrect Use of Connectives

Length of stay	3	2
Misuse	7	19
Overuse	39	19
Underuse	0	13
Grammar	53	50
Total	100	100

So far, the findings regarding the relationship between the use of connectives and length of study were discussed. In the next section, the discussion will address typical errors that the participants made, and probable causes of those errors will be suggested.

Typical Errors and their Probable Causes

Table 8 summarizes the percentage of each type of error related to individual connectives made by all the participants, without distinguishing between the two groups. It is noticeable that individual connectives were more associated with certain types of errors than others.

TABLE 8

Percentage of Errors of Connectives by Error Type and Each Connective

	and	*but*	*so*	*because*	*If*	*when*	*anyway*	*who*	*what*
Misuse	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overuse	56	36	86	0	0	0	0	0	0
Underuse	3	29	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Grammar	25	21	14	95	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	0	0	0	0	0

And and *so* were found to be most associated with overuse errors, which accounted for 56 % and 86%, respectively, of all the errors. The following examples illustrate the overuse of the two connectives.[6]

(1) *In the future, I want to be an English professor. And my father wants me to be an English professor, too. And I want to be a designer, too. And I have another one. I want to a good swimmer.* [overuse]

(2) Listen to the flute sound. *So, fly in the sky. Change to a bird and a wind.* [overuse]

[6] All these examples, in which *and* and *so* were placed at the beginning of a sentence, could be coded as grammar errors. However, following Azar (1989), according to whom those conventions are acceptable in informal writing, they were considered as grammatical.

The overuse of *and* and *so* has also been reported by several studies (e.g., Field & Yip, 1992; Goldman & Murray, 1992; Yde & Spoelders, 1985), which attribute such an overuse to the effect of colloquialism. In conversation, *and* and *so* frequently appear at the beginning of a sentence, functioning as a transitional coordinator and fostering a natural flow of conversation.[7] However, in writing, such a transition can be successfully carried out without any connectives or by starting a new paragraph. Not yet knowing this rule, the students in the present study may have transferred the conventions of speaking to writing.

Grammar errors were found to account for most of the errors in the use of *because*, as seen in the following examples.

(3) *My dream is a doctor. Because a doctor is a very good job.* [grammatical error]

(4) *I am going to give a gift to children. Because they are cute.* [grammatical error]

Yet, this kind of error is not peculiar to the participants in the present study: it is often considered a typical characteristic of ESL writing (Schleppegrell, 1992, 1996). According to Schleppegrell (1996), in colloquial discourse a *because*-clause functions as a coordinator rather than a subordinator in that it can lead an independent clause, introducing a main point and often providing additional information to what has been said. Yet, instead of connecting it intonationally to the prior statement, a separate intonational contour is assigned to the *because*-clause, as in the case of conjunctions such as *however* and *therefore*. Thus, the grammatical error involving *because* shown above can be due to the transfer of this

[7] Meyer (1996) suggests that this kind of *and* in speech, which is not connected to any previous clause or phrase but is an indicator of transition, should be categorized as a pragmatic coordination as opposed to grammatical coordination.

"conjunction strategy" from speech to writing (Schleppegrell, 1996, p. 278). This explanation is highly plausible because in a classroom setting language learners are frequently asked the question "Why?", to which they tend to answer with only a *because*-clause, without repeating the question (which would function as a matrix clause). Not being aware of the difference in register[8] between spoken and written discourses, they are likely to transfer the register of speech to writing.

Another probable cause for the ungrammatical use of a *because*-clause would be transfer from their first language. When asked for the meaning of the word *because*, teachers are likely to offer its potentially equivalent Korean word *Yae-Nya-Ha-Maen*,[9] which has a completely different usage. It functions as a coordinator in that it is restricted to an initial position in the second sentence (Greenbaum, Quirk, Leech, & Svartvik, 1990).[10]

Therefore, the following sentence is perfectly well-formed in Korean.

(5) *My dream is a doctor. Yae-Nya-Ha-Maen* [Because] *a doctor is a very good job.*

In other words, the students may have used *because* in the same way that they use *Yae-Nya-Ha-Maen* in Korean; that is, as a coordinator, in a sentence-initial position, leading an independent clause.

The errors with respect to the use of *but* were found to be quite evenly distributed among the four different categories of errors. However, the relative high percentage of overuse and underuse of *but* (36% and 29%, respectively) seems to

---

[8] Register refers to the different choice of lexical and grammatical resources characterizing a particular genre (Schleppegrell, 1996).

[9] The researcher examined three dictionaries published by the most renown publishers, and found that they also placed this Korean word first as the meaning of *because*.

[10] Thus, this Korean word is closely equivalent in meaning to *this is because* in English.

suggest that the adversative concept represented by *but* had yet to be learned or acquired by the students; this needs further testing. The following examples demonstrate the two kinds of incorrect uses.

(6) *I can make some clothes. (It's not really making, only drawing.)* <u>*But*</u> *I like to draw a new type of clothes.* [overuse]

(7) *My dream is a scientist. ... Scientist is more difficult and tiring.* (*But*) *My dream is good.* [underuse]

Finally, it is quite interesting that whenever *if*, *when*, *anyway*, *who*, and *what* were employed, they were used correctly. However, since these connectives were used only once, except for *if*, which was used 9 times by four participants, it cannot be argued that acquisition of those connectives has taken place.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between length of study and the use of connectives in writings by Korean learners of English, and analyzed their errors in using connectives. The hypotheses proposed in this study were partially confirmed. First, even though it had an effect on the number of connectives produced, length of study did not lead to producing a greater number of subordinators. Second, the group with 3 years of study employed a wider range of connectives, in both coordination and subordination, than that with 2 years of study. Third, length of study was shown to have an effect not only on correct uses but also on incorrect uses of connectives. The analysis of the errors made in using individual connectives revealed that different errors were involved more with certain types of connectives than with others. For instance, *and* and *so* were most subject to overuse, whereas

grammar errors were most responsible for the incorrect use of *because*. Yet, the incorrect use of *but* was evenly distributed among all categories of errors.

From these findings, several pedagogical implications can be derived. First, the participants in the present study tend to overgeneralize the rules about using connectives. Such an excessive use of linking devices, however, may hinder the natural flow of messages and lead to artificial and mechanical writing (Granger & Tyson, 1996). Thus, it is important that they become aware of when *not* to use them. Second, the students should be taught about the grammatical constraints of individual connectives, for a half of the incorrect uses of connectives in this study resulted from not observing those constraints. Learners also need to become aware of the difference in register between spoken and written discourse, since many errors in this study were caused by the transfer of the conventions of speech to writing. If the students are exposed to formal texts and come to understand the appropriate register for writing, such a transfer may be reduced (Goldman & Murray, 1992).

Yet, the findings and implications of this study can be challenged for certain methodological reasons. First, the interval between the two groups in terms of length of study is very short; thus, the results should be considered with caution. Second, the small sample size (N=18) is an obvious threat to the external validity of this research. An additional threat is the fact that the writing samples were not randomly selected. This research was based on writing samples of students who attended one specific English institute in Korea. Therefore, it is dubious whether the results are generalizable to the entire population of children with the same length of study or age. Besides, it cannot be argued that other connectives that were not produced by the participants are outside of the range of their competence. We cannot assert that since they did not use them, they had not acquired them yet.

Further studies regarding the use of connectives should distinguish between their internal and external use in the sense of Halliday and Hasan (1976), and

examine how those uses are related to proficiency or length of formal instruction. In addition, the investigation of the relationship between misused connectives and required connectives is worthy of study because it may deepen our understanding of the acquisition of connectives.

Finally, it should be emphasized that cohesion is only one aspect of good writing. It is quite possible that a piece of writing contains necessary and sufficient cohesive devices but still is unsatisfactory because the writer does not develop a theme that would make the text valuable. Nonetheless, increased mastery of cohesive devices and the awareness of the semantic and syntactic properties of connectives will certainly help students express their ideas more clearly (Granger & Tyson, 1996).

REFERENCES

Azar, B. S. (1989). *Understanding and using English grammar: Second edition.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Barnwell, D. (1988). Some comments on T-unit research. *System, 16,* 187-192.

Bebout, L. J., Segalowitz, S. J., & White, G. J. (1980). Children's comprehension of causal construction with "because" and "so". *Child Development, 51,* 565-568.

Beebe, L. (1980). Cohesion in interlanguage: A study of conjunction. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 806)

Broadhead, G. J., & Berlin, J. A. (1981). Twelve steps to using generative sentences and sentence combining in the composition classroom. *College Composition and Communication, 32,* 295-307.

Cameron, C. A., Lee, K., Webster, S., Kim, M., Hunt, A. K., & Linton, M. J. (1995). Text cohesion in children's narrative writing. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 16,* 257-269.

Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teachers course.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Crowhurst, M. (1987). Cohesion in argument and narration at three grade levels. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21,* 185-201.

Dromi, E., & Berman, R. A. (1986). Language-specific and language-general in developing syntax. *Journal of Child Language, 13,* 371-387.

Field, Y., & Yip, L. M. O. (1992). A comparison of internal cohesive conjunction in the English writing of Cantonese speakers of English. *RELC Journal, 23,* 15-28.

Frank, M. (1972). *Modern English: Exercise for non-native speakers: Part II: Sentences and complex structures.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc

Frodesen, J. & Eyring, J. (1993). *Grammar dimensions: Book four: Form, meaning, and use.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Goldman, S. R., & Murray, J. D. (1992). Knowledge of connectors as cohesion devices in text: A comparison study of native-English and English-as-a-second- language speakers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 4,* 504-519.

Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes, 15,* 17-27.

Greenbaum, S., Quirk, R., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1990). *A student's grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.

Gutierrez-Clellen, V. F., & Hofstetter, R. (1994). Syntactic complexity in Spanish narratives: A developmental study. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 37,* 645-654.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hinds, J. (1987). Readers versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor and R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kanno, Y. (1989). The use of connectives in English academic papers written by Japanese students. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 721)

Klecan-Aker, J. S., & Lopez, B. (1985). A comparison of T- units and cohesive tests used by first and third grade children. *Language and Speech, 28,* 307-315.

McClure, E. F., & Steffensen, M. S. (1985). A study of the use of conjunctions across grades and ethnic groups. *Research in the Teaching of English, 19,* 217-236.

McCulley, G. A. (1985). Writing quality, coherence, and cohesion. *Research in the Teaching of English, 19,* 269-270.

Meyer, C. F. (1996). Coordinate structures in English. *World Englishes, 15,* 29-41.

Milton, J. & Tsang, E. S. C. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students writing: directions for future research. In R. Pemberton & E. S. C. Tsang (Eds.), *Studies in Lexis* (pp. 215-246). Hong Kong: The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Needles, M. C., & Knapp, M. S. (1994). Teaching writing to children who are underserved. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86,* 339-349.

Neuner, J. L. (1987). Cohesive ties and chains in good and poor freshmen essays. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21,* 92-102.

Norment, N. (1994). Contrastive analyses of cohesive devices in Chinese and Chinese ESL in narrative and expository written texts. *JCLTA, 28,* 49-81.

Norment, N. (1995). Contrastive analyses of cohesive devices in Spanish and Spanish ESL in narrative and expository written texts. *Language Quarterly, 33,* 135-159.

Rentel, V. M., & King, M. L. (1983). Present at the beginning. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, & S. Walmsley (Eds.), *Research on writing: Principles and methods* (pp. 139- 176). New York: Longman.

Schleppegrell, M. (1992). Subordination and linguistic complexity. *Discourse Processes, 15,* 117-131.

Schleppegrell, M. (1996). Conjunction in spoken English and ESL writing. *Applied Linguistics, 17,* 271-285.

Scott, C. M. (1988). Producing complex sentences. *Topics in Language Disorder, 8,* 44-62.

Tierney, R. & Mosenthal, J. (1983). Cohesion and textual coherence. *Research in the Teaching of English, 17,* 215- 229.

Witte, S. P., & Faigley, L. (1981). Coherence, cohesion and writing quality. *College Composition and Communication, 32,* 189-204.

Yde, P., & Spoelders, M. (1985). Text cohesion: An exploratory study with beginning writers. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 6,* 407-416.

Zamel, V. (1983). Teaching those missing links in writing. *ELT Journal, 37,* 22-29.

Zarnowski, M. S. (1983). Cohesion in student narratives: Grade four, six, and eight. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 569)

APPENDIX A

Participants Age and Length of Study

Participants	Age (years)	Length of study (years)
1	12	3
2	12	3
3	12	2
4	12	2
5	12	3
6	11	2.5
7	11	3
8	10	3
9	11	3
10	10	3
11	10	2
12	11	2
13	11	3
14	10	2
15	10	3
16	11	3
17	10	3
18	10	3

2c

APPENDIX B

Samples of Students Writing Productions

Participant 1

In the future, I want to be an English professor. Because I like English the most, and I can speak English better than most of people. (But there are many people who can speak English better than me.) And my father wants me to be an English professor, too. And I want to be a designer, too. I want to make clothes. I can't design very well, but I want to be a designer. I can make some clothes. (Its not really making, only drawing!) But I like to draw a new type of clothes. And I have another one. I want to be a good swimmer. I can swim well too. I can do most of sports, but swimming is the best sport for me. And I like water too. Swimming is very fun. I want to be other things too, like a doctor, a translator, and so on, but these three are my wish.

Participant 7

My dream is a fashion designer because I want to make clothes and I like drawing pictures. I want to be a fashion designer. And my dream is a teacher because I like young children and I want to teach children. But, my brother dream is great judge. My father wants me to be an anchor. My mother wants me to be a doctor because she was a nurse when my mother was young. She wants me to be a doctor. I want to be a teacher like John, Jennifer and my schoolteachers. I'll make much money. I want to work and study hard. But I don't like math and subject. Teacher is a good job. Fashion designer too. I will be happy.

Participant 9

My dream is a doctor. Because a doctor is very good job. I am going to help the sick and hurt people. I am going to make new medicine. It'll save a person's life. So I am going to become famous. I like baby. I want to open a children's hospital. The children will love me. Because I am going to be a kind doctor. I am going to give a gift to children. Because they are cute. And I'll give a sweet medicine. I don't like a bitter taste medicine. The children are same. I'm going to love my job. So I'm going to be a very good doctor. Because I'm going to love my job and all happy!

Participant 18

I am a student. I like to sing and talk. I want to be a diplomat. Because I like to talk and English. But I want to be a teacher, diplomat, pianist, writer, sports player. I hate math, so I don't want to be a scientist. My favorite subject is Korean and English. But my parents want me to be a doctor, lawyer, judge, and prosecutor. I don't like that jobs. Because they are not my aptitude. In my future, I will be a diplomat. And I live any country. I publicize my country Korea.